

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 15-17 are presented for consideration. Claims 1 and 15 are independent.

Claims 1-5 and 15 have been amended. Claims 16 and 17 are newly-presented. Support for the amendments and the newly-presented claims can be found in the original specification, at least at, for example, page 14, line 23, *et seq.* No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-6 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Robar et al. '313 in view of Yoshida '005 and Dow et al. '904.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 relates to a method of reading a plurality of film originals, each being mounted with a slide mount, which are placed on an original support of an image reading apparatus and displaying the plurality of film originals on a monitor unit of a computer connected to the image reading apparatus. The method includes, *inter alia*, an image reading step of reading each of the plurality of film originals placed on the original support, identifying a number of frames of film originals simultaneously present on the original support, and cutting out image areas for each of the frames of film originals to generate a plurality of image signals. Also included is a read image signal display step of simultaneously displaying the plurality of image signals on one display screen of the monitor unit in the landscape placement and in a form of a thumbnail type display.

Robar et al. relates to a method and system for creating volumetric data sets. A plurality of films 12 are exposed to a radiation field 17, and subsequently processed to provide a series of two-dimensional images. The films are then scanned by a scanner 20 and digitized. The digitized image is then provided to a computer 22, which separates, orients, and sequences the

respective images. The images are then separately processed by the computer. Software analyzes each pixel of a digitized image and converts each pixel into a radiation dose. The dose data is then entered into a three-dimensional data structure to produce a dose distribution array - which is then displayed on a suitable monitor. Robar et al. discloses that one type of format for displaying the dose distribution data is the Digital Imaging and Communications in Medicine (DICOM) format. (Robar et al., column 5, line 45 - column 7, line 56).

The Advisory Action alleges, on page 2, that Robar et al. discloses that images comprising at least four films 12 is displayed as a single image in DICOM format on a suitable monitor. Applicant respectfully disagrees. As discussed above each film image is separated from the single-scanned image, and separately processed. Therefore, because the images are separated and separately processed, Applicant submits that contrary to the Advisory Action, the images (films) are not displayed “simultaneously.”

In addition, the Advisory Action alleges, on page 2, that the DICOM image, when displayed, corresponds to simultaneously displaying four films in DICOM format. However, Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 1 recites, among other features, an image reading step of...cutting out **image areas** for each of the frames of film originals **to generate a plurality of image signals**, and a read image signal display step of **simultaneously displaying the plurality of image signals** on one display screen of the monitor unit. (emphasis added). As previously discussed in the Request for Reconsideration, filed March 2, 2010, Robar et al. does not disclose that images of the films 12 scanned by the scanner 20 are displayed on a monitor. On the contrary, as Applicant understands, Robar et al. only discloses that dose data, derived from the analysis of the scanned films is displayed. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Robar

et al. does not teach or suggest, among other features, a read image signal display step of simultaneously displaying the plurality of image signals on one display screen of the monitor unit in the landscape placement and in a form of a thumbnail type display, as recited in Claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that neither Yoshida or Dow et al. remedy the deficiencies of Robar et al. discussed above. Therefore, even assuming, *arguendo*, that the combination of Robar et al., Yoshida, and Dow et al. is proper, the proposed combination does not teach or suggest features of Applicant's invention as recited in Claim 1.

Claim 15 relates to a system for reading a plurality of film originals, and generally corresponds to Claim 1. Therefore, at least for the reasons discussed above in regard to Claim 1, Applicant submits that the proposed combination of Robar et al., Yoshida, and Dow et al. does not teach or suggest features of Applicant's invention as recited in Claim 15.

Claims 2-6 depend either directly, or indirectly, from Claim 1. Accordingly, at least for the reasons discussed above in regard to Claim 1, Applicant submits that the proposed combination of applied references does not teach or suggest features of Applicant's invention as recited in Claims 2-6.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-6 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Newly-presented Claims 16 and 17 depend from Claims 1 and 15, respectively. Therefore, at least for the reasons discussed above in regard to Claims 1 and 15, Applicant submits that the Claims 16 and 17 are patentable over the applied references.

Applicant submits that present invention as set forth in the independent claims is patentable over the applied references. In addition, the dependent claims set forth additional

features of Applicant's invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested. Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean M. Walsh/

Sean M. Walsh
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 63,510

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
SMW:ayr

FCHS_WS 4907307v1